Course analysis template

After the course has ended, the course leader fills in this template. This is an important part of the quality assurance of the programme. The programme director decides whether the template should be supplemented with further information/questions.

Course code	Course title	Credits
5HI019	User Needs, Requirements Engineering, and Evaluation	10 HP
Semester	Period	
VT2024	2024-01-15- 2024-03-17	

Course leader	Examiner
Nadia Davoody	Sabine Koch
Other participating teachers	**Other participating teachers**
Sabine Koch, Aboozar Eghdam, Anders Thelemyr, Richard Whitehand, Leonard Mauco, Leo Kowalski, Ulf Lesly, Chen His Tsai, Natalia Stathakarou, Luciana Hamamoto Terceiro, Jamie Luckahaus	

Number of registered students	Number passed after regular session	Response rate for course survey (%)
42	29	69.05%

Methods for student influence other than course survey
The course consists of three moments/blocks. Throughout the whole course, the students were asked to provide feedback about the seminars and different parts of the course.

Note that…

This analysis shall (together with a summary of the quantitative results of the students' course survey) be submitted to the LIME educational committee.

This analysis has been submitted to the LIME educational committee on this date:

1. Description of any implemented changes since the previous course based on previous students' comments

This year, as in previous years, the material underwent updates, and some outdated materials were removed. Two more lectures were introduced in the Evaluation block, addressing feedback from previous students. However, further improvements are necessary to increase interactivity and incorporate additional real-life examples into these lectures. Despite some ongoing challenges within some groups, the course leader actively supported conflict resolution efforts. Moreover, the course leader provided additional instructions regarding assignments and the home exam. Nevertheless, based on feedback from this year's students,

further improvements are required to clarify assignment instructions for future iterations of the course.

2. A brief summary of the students' evaluations of the course
(Based on the students' quantitative answers to the course evaluation and comments. Quantitative compilation and possible graphs attached.)

29 out of 42 students have completed the course evaluation survey. Twenty-two students had a clinical background and seven had a technical background. For each question of the survey, the mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation, as a percentage, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of the students' evaluation of the course.

#	Question	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation (%)
1	In my view, I have developed valuable expertise/skills during the course.	3.7	0.8	22.6%
2	In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.	3.9	0.7	17.9 %
3	In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	4.0	0.7	18.1 %
4	In my view, the course has promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning (e.g., analytical and critical thinking, independent search for and evaluation of information).	3.9	0.8	21.0 %
5	In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content.	4.0	0.9	23.8 %
6	Teaching was based on real examples to develop students' professional knowledge.	3.8	0.9	23.2 %
7	My previous knowledge was sufficient to follow the course.	3.9	0.9	22.7 %
8	The course was challenging enough for me.	3.3	1.0	30.2 %
	AVERAGE	**3.8**	**0.8**	**22.4 %**

The structured approach of the course, including group assignments and relevant study themes, received positive feedback. In addition, the students appreciated working with real-life applications and practical skills development. The students appreciated the frequent opportunities for presentations, and they were satisfied with the quality of the guest lectures and enjoyed the study visit. Overall, students valued the engaging teaching style, positive atmosphere, relevant study visits, and the opportunity to apply their learning to real projects.

The students, however, were not satisfied with some parts of the course. Overall, feedback from students highlighted some areas for improvement in the course. These included the need for more real-life examples mainly in the 'Evaluation' block, and clearer assignment instructions. Additionally, students expressed a desire for better communication between lecturers and more standardization in grading criteria to ensure fairness and clarity. Additionally, they recommended incorporating technical evaluation and data perspectives

into the curriculum. However, this recommendation depends on the aim of the course and the intended learning outcomes in the course plan.

3. The course-responsible reflection on the course implementation and results

Course strengths:
- Interactive learning methods, such as group work and presentations and real-life examples
- Effective integration of practical experiences, including study visits and guest lectures
- Engaging teaching style and provision of detailed feedback

Course weaknesses:
- Unclear assignment instructions
- Lack of real-life examples in lectures mainly in the evaluation block.
- Inconsistent communication between lecturers regarding the grading and assessment of the assignments and the exam.

3. Other comments
---

4. The course-responsible conclusions and any proposals for changes
(If any changes are proposed, please specify who is responsible for implementing these and a time schedule.)

In response to students' feedback, the course leader will enhance assignment descriptions for clarity. The evaluation block will undergo improvements with the integration of real-life examples into lectures. Additionally, clear communication channels will be established among course instructors to reduce confusion regarding assignment assessment and exam procedures.